Welcome and Introduction (Capt. Teresa Bloom and Lt. Tim Tannenbaum)

10:05 a.m. Start

Capt. Bloom and Lt. Tannenbaum spoke about the task and scope of the subcommittee.

Review of Workshop Responses

Carly Riter asked for clarification about the questions section of the scoping document.

Capt. Bloom explained those questions were based on the topics identified by members in the workshop and are intended to help the subcommittee identify policy areas to include in the September report, to compromise on in the future, to gather more information about, to not include, or to refer to other subcommittees.

Reporting Requirements

The subcommittee discussed reporting requirements for disengagements and miles traveled by autonomous vehicles.

Capt. Bloom clarified that data reporting is relevant to law enforcement because it would be helpful for finding fault in a crash.

Carly Riter raised concerns about protection of intellectual property.

Lt. Tannenbaum mentioned that information about other states’ reporting and data collection requirements would be useful.
The subcommittee generally agreed data reporting in a testing scheme is primarily a topic for the subcommittee on licensing and registration.

Jebediah Doran asked if there should be certain geographic areas where AVs are not allowed to operate autonomously. Lt. Tannenbaum felt such restrictions would be difficult to enforce, and Carly Riter felt they would not be appropriate for level 5 vehicles.

The subcommittee continued to consider what manner of test data manufacturers should be required to report.

Daniel Fernández mentioned how disengagements over miles traveled has become a common safety benchmark.

Carly Riter noted that data on disengagements and miles traveled may not perfectly represent the readiness of automated technology because manufacturers may deliberately seek out edge cases to test the automated driving system in new situations.

Commissioner Leiken wanted to make sure that testing would be applicable to rural counties as well as urban areas.

Capt. Bloom asked if industry could identify the sort of information that could be shared to help law enforcement goals without compromising intellectual property. She suggested referring this question to other subcommittees.

The subcommittee agreed to table this and await more information from the Subcommittee on Licensing and Registration.

The subcommittee discussed policy around updating AV software.

Daniel Fernández said he expects vehicles to update over the air at home. He mentioned it is possible a vehicle could be disabled if not updated.

The subcommittee considered whether it was this committee’s purview to deal with updating requirements. Subcommittee members generally agreed that this issue would be better addressed in the Subcommittee on Licensing and Registration, but noted it would be helpful to have information on whether software was up to date during crash investigations or when pulling vehicles over.

**Safety Requirements**

The subcommittee felt that safety standards were the purview of the National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and did not need to be addressed in this body.

The subcommittee discussed the issue of collecting data relating to crimes committed in or with AVs. The committee generally felt that existing laws sufficiently addressed these potential situations.

Lt. Tannenbaum noted that OnStar is generally helpful to law enforcement, and he expects AV manufacturers will be as well.
Traffic Laws and Driver Responsibilities

The subcommittee discussed the challenges that AVs face in adapting to varying regulations across different jurisdictions and navigating safety zones.

The subcommittee discussed the scope of their work and considered whether deployment needs to be addressed in their recommendations. The subcommittee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of trying to prepare for deployment now.

Daniel Fernández clarified the nature of level 4 and 5 vehicles and cautioned against applying different rules to automated and conventional vehicles.

The subcommittee noted that a provision to allow platooning was passed in the legislature.

Capt. Bloom recommended that minimum age laws be referred to licensing and registration and that seatbelt laws did not need to change. Lt. Tannenbaum added that current impaired driving laws should also be adequate for addressing AVs.

The subcommittee discussed how the distracted driving laws may need to be updated to take into account vehicles of different levels of automation.

Carly Riter agreed that the spirit of current distracted driving laws should be applied to AVs, but the language will need to be tailored to situations specific to AVs.

Commissioner Leiken wanted to keep in mind any infrastructure improvements that will be needed for safe AV deployment.

Law Enforcement and First Responder Engagement

Capt. Bloom spoke in favor of clearly identifying AVs for law enforcement officers.

Lt. Tannenbaum said any identification should be subtle and that there should be information in the Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) about a vehicle’s level of automation.

Daniel Fernández asked the subcommittee to consider that regulation of markings or override systems might be best handled at the federal level.

The subcommittee decided to seek more information about how AVs are marked in other states.

Capt. Bloom wanted to know how an AV could be pulled over by law enforcement officers.

The subcommittee decided law enforcement and dispatcher training should be a priority.

Public Comment

Robin Ness from ODOT’s Crash Analysis & Reporting Unit asked the subcommittee to keep in mind the kind of data would be collected from a crash, since it would likely find its way into public databases.
Recap and Next Steps

The subcommittee clarified the actionable points from their discussion.

- ODOT staff will provide information about the policies of other states regarding distracted driving laws, marking of AVs, and deployment and testing.
- ODOT staff will research crash reporting requirements in other states.
- Capt. Bloom assigned subcommittee members the task of reviewing the crash and incident reporting section of the scoping document. Members will send any recommendations or comments they have about that section to the subcommittee to be compiled. This will make for a more succinct discussion next meeting.

11:30 end

Areas of Consensus and Areas for Further Discussion

Reporting Requirements

The subcommittee agreed to table the reporting requirements discussion to wait to hear from the Subcommittee on Licensing and Registration.

Areas for further discussion:

- How to ensure useful data will be available to law enforcement

Safety Requirements

The subcommittee agreed that this area should be handled by NHTSA and did not need to be addressed in this subcommittee.

Traffic Laws and Driver Responsibilities

The subcommittee agreed that current seatbelt and impaired driving laws do not need to be changed.

The subcommittee decided that minimum age laws should be addressed in the Subcommittee on Licensing and Registration.

Areas for further discussion:

- Distracted driving laws
- Roles and responsibilities of various users of autonomous vehicles
- AV safety or restrictions in safety zones

Law Enforcement and First Responder Engagement

The subcommittee agreed that education/training of law enforcement, first responders, and possibly dispatchers should be addressed in this body.

Areas for further discussion:
- Education of the general public
- Law enforcement capability to stop AVs
- How industry can provide useful data to law enforcement without compromising IP
- Making sure data gathered or received from Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) is in a useable format